UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,209	10/28/2003	Erik Normann Steen	135272 (SPLG 1041USI)	4504
45436 THE SMALL	7590 05/04/200 PATENT LAW GROU		EXAMINER	
611 OLIVE ST	TREET, SUITE 1611		JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J	
ST. LOUIS, M	O 63101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		•			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/695,209	STEEN, ERIK NORMANN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jaworski Francis J.	3768			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl. briod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tatute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. bly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	6 February 2007.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice und	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 - 33</u> is/are pending in the applic	ation.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 - 33</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	rrection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docum					
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	·	·			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•	eceived in this National Stage			
application from the International Bu	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	and the state of			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceivea.			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date			
 2) \(\subseteq \) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) \(\subseteq \) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	5) 🔲 Notice of Infe	ormal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	-			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/695,209

Art Unit: 3768

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 33 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Newman (US6544175, of record) and Savord et al. (US5993390). Newman teaches structure and method for alternative ultrasound subvolume imaging modalities including subvolume switching based upon a single frame, col. 6 top portion, utilization of sparse volume line spacing col. 7, and subvolume imaging with uneven refresh to accommodate regions having different robustness of motion, col. 7 top, and includes vertical slicing as an implementation option per col. 8. Data overwrite for the currently updated subvolume produces the appearance of continuously updated display. Savord et al similarly teaches structure and method for single memory 28 implementation of a real-time low resolution subvolume of either vertical slices Fig. 5 or subvolume sectors Fig. 6 where col. 6 lines 27 – 51 suggests that the subvolume scan at low resolution may be built up such that when completed the high resolution cineloop may then be displayed. A greater flexibility to the number of subvolumes and number of ECG-triggered physiologic cycles is suggested. Accordingly the two references together would suggest that a complete and usable realtime image may be produced which, with either per-frame interleave updating or preference

Art Unit: 3768

updating to regions of vigorous motion or reduced resolution either in terms of reduced line firing number or reduced number of contiguous subregions interleaved per physiologic cycle which with judicious choice of the number of subregions or subvolumes and the number of physiologic cycles in the image build-up sequence adequately represents a region of greater physiologic motion and near-optimally represents a region in which physiologic motion is less dramatic, alternative to or in a supplementing prelude to non-realtime cineloop display.

Response to Arguments

Applicants arguments that Newman and Savord et al are not combinable for purposes of rejection of the claims is not well-taken since both are directed to subvolume imaging in conjunction with the obtainance of subregion image data, the former being operable in a real-time refresh mode where joining of the image data may pertain to such refresh update per col. 6 lines 57 – 63; Savord et al teaches specifically that what such would mean in this context would be a display after the physiologically triggered sub-regions are obtained and where the sections are seamlessly joined by elimination of overlapping portions.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3768

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

4-26-07

Primary Examiner